Original

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY OPIGHAL

In the Matter of:			
Maritime Communications/La	nd Mobile, LLC	EB Docket No.11-71	
DATE OF HEARING:_	_June 15, 2011	VOLUME:	_1
PLACE OF HEARING:_	_WASHINGTON	N, D.C PAGES:_	1-115

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 TELEPHONE (202) 234-4433

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of) EB Docket No. 11-71 MARITIME COMMUNICATIONS/LAND) File No. EB-09-IH-1751 MOBILE, LLC) FRN: 0013587779 Participant in Auction No. 61 and) Application File Nos. Licensee of Various Authorizations in) 0004030479, 0004144435 the Wireless Radio Services) 0004193028, 0004193328) 0004354053, 0004309872) 0004310060, 0004314903 Applicant for Modification of Various Authorization in the Wireless Radio) 0004315013, 0004430505 Services) 0004417199, 0004419431) 0004422320, 0004422329 Applicant with ENCANA OIL AND GAS (USA),) 0004507921, 0004153701) 0004526264, 0004636537 INC.; DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY, DCP MIDSTREAM, LP; JACKSON COUNTY) and 0004604962 RURAL MEMBERSHIP ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE; PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.; ENBRIDGE ENERGY COMPANY, INC.; INTERSTATE POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY; WISCONSIN POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY; DIXIE ELECTRIC MEMBERSHIP CORPORATION, INC.; ATLAS PIPELINE-MID CONTINENT, LLC.; DENTON COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., DBA COSERV ELECTRIC; AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY For Commission Consent to the Assignment) of Various Authorizations in Wireless Radio Service) Wednesday, June 15, 2011 Volume 1

> Hearing Room TW-A363 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C.

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE JUDGE RICHARD L. SIPPEL Chief Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Federal Communications Commission
PAMELA S. KANE, ESQ
Deputy Chief
BRAIN J. CARTER, ESQ
Investigations & Hearings Division
Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554
(202) 418-2393

On Behalf of the Licensee, Maritime Communications/Land Mobile, LLC BOB KELLER, ESQ Law Offices of Robert J. Keller, P.C. 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 240 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 223-2100

On Behalf of the Petitioners, Warren C. Havens; Environmental, LLC; Intelligent Transportation and Monitoring Wireless, LLC.; Skybridge Spectrum Foundation; Telesaurus Holdings GB, LLC; Verde Systems, LLC; and V2G LLC HOWARD M. LIEBERMAN, ESQ PATRICK R. McFADDEN, ESQ Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP 1500 K Street, N.W. Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20005-1209 (202) 842-8876

On Behalf of the Applicants, Atlas Pipeline Mid-Continent, LLC; DCP Midstream, LP; Enbridge Energy Company, Inc.; EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Jackson County Rural Electric Inc.; and Membership Corporation JACK RICHARDS, ESQ WESLEY K. WRIGHT, ESQ Keller and Heckman, LLP 1001 G Street, N.W. Suite 500 West Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 434-4210

On Behalf of the Applicant, Denton County Electric Cooperative, Inc. ROBERT J. MILLER, ESQ Gardere Wynn Sewell, LLP 3000 Thanksgiving Tower 1601 Elm Street Dallas, Texas 75201-4761 (214) 999-3000

On Behalf of the Applicant, Dixie Electric Membership Corporation, Inc.
ALBERT J. CATALANO, ESQ
Catalano & Plache, PLLC
3221 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 338-3200

On Behalf of the Applicants, Interstate Power & Light Company and Wisconsin Power & Light Company KURT E. DeSOTO, ESQ JOSHUA S. TURNER, ESQ Wiley Rein, LLP 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 719-7235

On Behalf of the Applicant, Southern California Regional Rail Authority

HARRY F. COLE, ESQ Fletcher, Heald & Hilreth, PLC 11th Floor 1300 North 17th Street Arlington, Virginia 22209 (703) 812-04823

On Behalf of the Applicant, Puget Sound Energy Inc.

JEFFREY L. SHELDON, ESQ
Fish & Richardson, P.C.

1425 K Street, N.W.

11th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 783-5070

On Behalf of the Applicant, Duquesne Light Company GERIT F. HULL, ESQ Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 12th Floor Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 659-6657

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 9:32 a.m. 2 JUDGE SIPPEL: Good morning. My name 3 is Richard Sippel. I'm the Chief Administrative 4 Law Judge and also I'm designated Presiding Judge 5 in this case which is, I'm going to call it 6 Maritime Communication et al, Enforcement Bureau 7 Docket Number 11-71. 8 hearing designation 9 received a order, FCC 11M-14. That was released on 14 June 10 of this year. 11 I'm assisted in the courtroom by my 12 13 Law Clerk, Mr. Ross and my Court Clerk Ms. Gosse. So, anyway they are here to assist me and assist 14 you if we need help. Okay. 15 Now, I'm going to first take an order 16 of appearance and I'm just interested in -- well, 17 let me start with Maritime because Maritime is 18 really the central party in this case from my 19 20 vantage point. So, counsel for Maritime? 21

MR. KELLER: Your Honor, Robert Keller

1	for Maritime.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Keller, good
3	morning, sir.
4	MR. KELLER: Good morning.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: And then on behalf of
6	Mr. Havens.
7	MR. LIEBERMAN: Good morning, Your
8	Honor, Howard Lieberman on behalf
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Lieberman.
10	MR. LIEBERMAN: of Warren Havens
11	and the companies related to Warren Havens and
12	with me is my colleague, Patrick McFadden.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. McFadden. My
14	goodness you have changed.
15	Okay. I will take in order of
16	appearances. Probably we can do it by what's in
17	the case, but let's start some place. And let me
18	get the Bureau first. Bureau counsel.
19	MS. KANE: Pamela Kane for the Bureau.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Ms. Kane.
21	MR. CARTER: Good morning, Your Honor,
22	Brian Carter, the Bureau.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Carter. Great.
2	Now, let's start with I'm going to
3	call you the Petitioner parties, is that correct?
4	I'm sorry, the Applicant parties.
5	Mr. Havens is the Petitioner party.
6	Let's go with the Applicant parties then. Anyone
7	want to start?
8	MR. RICHARDS: Your Honor, our
9	client's name is first in the Applicant list so
10	if I could go first?
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
12	MR. RICHARDS: My name is Jack
13	Richards and with me is Wesley Wright from Keller
14	and Heckman. We have five clients in this
15	proceeding including EnCana Oil and Gas, USA;
16	Atlas Pipeline Mid-Content, LLC.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's down aways?
18	MR. RICHARDS: Down aways, yes.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Atlas Pipeline?
20	MR. RICHARDS: Yes, sir.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
22	MR. RICHARDS: DCP Midstream, LP;

1	Enbridge Company, Inc.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
3	MR. RICHARDS: Jackson County Rural
4	Electric Membership Corporation. Those are the
5	five.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Those are the
7	five. Well, thank you very much.
8	MR. RICHARDS: Thank you. And who
9	wants to go next?
10	MR. HULL: Your Honor, I'm Gerit Hull.
11	My client is Duquesne Light Company. My law firm
12	is Eckert Seamans and I'm here in place of
13	Charlie Zdebski who has actually, I believe,
14	entered an appearance already.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: The name sounds
16	familiar. Is that Duquesne?
17	MR. HULL: Yes, Duquesne.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's all, just
19	Duquesne?
20	MR. HULL: Just Duquesne.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And next?
22	MR. COLE: Good morning, Your Honor.

1	My name is Albert Catalano with Catalano &
2	Plache. My client is Dixie Electric Membership
3	Corporation, Inc., also known as DEMCO.
4	MR. MILLER: Your Honor, my name is
5	Robert Miller. I'm here representing Denton
6	County Electric Co-op, d/b/a CoServ Electric from
7	the law firm of Gardere Wynn Sewell in Dallas,
8	Texas.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
10	Do you have a Washington Office or are
11	you
12	MR. MILLER: No, I came for the
13	hearing.
14	MR. TURNER: Good morning, Your Honor.
15	Joshua Turner on behalf of Interstate Power and
16	Light and Wisconsin Power and Light Company with
17	Wiley Rein, LLP. And with me is Kurt DeSoto.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. DeSoto, good
19	morning.
20	MR. DeSOTO: Good morning, Your Honor.
21	MR. TURNER: Good morning.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: And what was it,

1	Interstate and
2	MR. TURNER: Interstate Power and
3	Light, IPL, and Wisconsin Power and Light.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
5	MR. TURNER: WPL.
6	MR. SHELDON: Jeffrey Sheldon with
7	Fish & Richardson on behalf of Puget Sound
8	Energy.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
10	MR. COLE: Your Honor, on behalf of
11	Southern California Regional Rail Authority, I'm
12	Harry Cole of the firm of Fletcher, Heald &
13	Hilreth.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Cole you also
15	MR. COLE: That was somebody else, I'm
16	sure.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you so much, Mr.
18	Cole. You're Southern Cal. Okay. Southern Cal
19	exclusively, is that correct?
20	MR. COLE: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. And you have
22	been most actively involved with the Footnote 7

issue? 1 MR. COLE: That's correct. 2 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Ι 3 Now, think the first order of business, I'm going to 4 5 start with a few questions for Bureau counsel. I have to find my questions. Here they are. 6 don't find these questions, Mr. Ross is going to 7 be very upset with me. 8 I want to know why are the -- well, 9 tell me your explanation as to why -- well, I got 10 them down as the CIIs but those would be the 11 Why are they named in the caption 12 Applicant's. of the case? 13 MS. KANE: They are named in the 14 caption of the case because we have to designate 15 16 the applications at issue for consideration in the hearing. 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: But they're not being 18 charged with any violations. 19 MS. KANE: Correct. The assignees are 20 not being charged with anything in particular. 21 But the applications at issue are Maritime's --22

the spectrum at issue in those applications is 1 2 license to Maritime and, therefore, by statute we needed to designate those applications. So by 3 virtue of that aspect, they had the option to be 4 a party in the hearing. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: You said they had the 6 option to be a party or are they here as sort of 7 like prisoners where they --8 9 MS. KANE: Well, Your Honor, they may characterize it as such, but they certainly had 10 the ability not to file a Notice of Appearance 11 and not to be a party in the matter. 12 Well, then you find JUDGE SIPPEL: 13 yourself in default status. I don't know if 14 that's a good idea. I mean, under the Statute do 15 they have the option to, you know, is it a may --16 you may be made a party, you may be made a party 17 or something like that or does it say you shall 18 19 be? I believe they have the MS. KANE: 20 option, Your Honor, to be a party. 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: Anybody want to respond 22

to that or comment on that? 1 2 Yes, sir MR. RICHARDS: I will comment that we 3 have an option to stand back. If we did not file 4 a Notice of Appearance our application would have 5 been dismissed with prejudice under Paragraph 68, 6 hardly an option in real life. 7 broadest JUDGE SIPPEL: Ιn the 8 interpretation of option wouldn't buy that one, I 9 I agree wholeheartedly. I'm not trying 10 11 to press it. I just want to know what the situation is here. So, then if the Statute says 12 13 they're supposed to be here 14 notwithstanding the fact that they're 15 particularly -at least some are not particularly interested in being here, what can I 16 do to get rid of them, to get them out of this 17 18 hearing? I know -- well, let me ask you the 19 20 question. Let me ask it that way. That's pretty broad. Let me ask you. 21

MS. KANE: I am not sure at this time

that Your F	Honor has the authority to do muc
about that.	I mean it's pending before th
Commission	at the moment regarding thei
petitions f	or reconsideration about whether c
not they sh	ould have the option to be exclude
from the hea	aring.
Ċ	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I know what you'r
talking abou	it. You're talking about the Footnot
7?	
Ŋ	MS. KANE: Correct.
ć	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's
different ro	oute. That's an eight floor route.
1	MS. KANE: Correct.
ú	JUDGE SIPPEL: I want a courtroo
route.	
Ŋ	MS. KANE: I am not aware of
courtroom re	oute.
Ŋ	MR. KELLER: Your Honor?
Ċ	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir.
ľ	MR. KELLER: Speaking for Maritime,
believe tha	t by way of characterizing what th
Commission :	is saying is essentially that one o

the reasons these people are a party to the hearing is because the theory would be that if finding basic there's ultimate on an qualifications against Maritime, and therefore, the licenses are revoked, then obviously that moots the assignment. That seems to be the sole purpose of their being designated in this hearing because they have the fortune misfortune of being assignees of licenses which are currently under this revocation order.

We would advocate an approach that we believe Your Honor has the discretion to do of limiting them the option of giving obligations to participate in the hearing. other words, because they're being made parties, they are, therefore, not required to do all the things that parties deal with in terms of discovery and everything else. And there may be ways that you can limit that and simply carve them out to the side making a note that -- we would almost suggest perhaps deferring the issues of these applications in sort of a bifurcated

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 proceeding. In other words, let's go ahead and have the hearing on the basic qualifications 2 issues and the construction termination issues. 3 Then if Maritime survives that, then we can look 4 at, you know, what to do with these parties. 5 probably will not require an evidentiary hearing 6 on their issues at that point. But prior to 7 that, if there's a finding against Maritime, then 8 these applications become moot. 9 So, that would be my suggestion as the 10 way to -- you can't subject to, off the top of my 11 head right now, think the Bureau may be right, 12 but you can't just dismiss them from the hearing. 13 14 But I think you can bifurcate the hearing and address their issues separately when and if it 15 becomes not moot. 16 MS. KANE: Your Honor? 17 MR. KELLER: Your Honor? 18 Well, just a second. JUDGE SIPPEL: 19 Because I know I was going to get to that with 20 Mr. -- it's Gerrit Hull, is that correct? 21 MR. HULL: Yes, Your Honor. 22

Is Seamans your firm? 1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Eckert Seamans, correct. 2 MR. HULL: Eckert Seamans, okay. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: 4 Duquesne has a motion pending to bifurcate. MR. HULL: And so do -- excuse me. 5 And so do a number of the other --6 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: There are two of them The most recent one pending, that's correct. 8 9 I've seen came in yesterday which kind of jogged me, but I know exactly what you're saying. 10 And it was represented in yesterday's 11 papers from Mr. Hull -- Mr. Hull's firm that they 12 met with the Bureau for two days and couldn't get 13 an agreement from the Bureau to bifurcate. 14 MS. Well, Your Honor, the 15 KANE: Bureau's concern is that each of the petitioners, 16 17 both the Duquesne's motion for bifurcation and the other CII petitioner's motion for bifurcation 18 seeks a broad cut-off of discovery of those 19 parties going forward, either until a certain 20 date or on only certain issues. And the Bureau's 21

concern is that that will limit our ability to

seek discovery that they may have relevant to the 1 2 issues that they have designated as part of the 3 liability phase or directly solely to Maritime. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I can assure the 4 5 Bureau that any person, any party is going to be subject to discovery if they have relevant 6 7 evidence and you're seeking it. I mean, that's 8 not going to be an exclusion. So, I don't care 9 if they're in or out of the case. 10 MS. KANE: Well, that was the basis of our concern, Your Honor, but we didn't feel that 11 12 it was appropriate to impose a burden on the Bureau to obtain discovery by putting them in the 13 category of let's say a third party now where we 14 15 would not have those additional subpoena burdens 16 as party. JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, we'll handle that. 17 Don't worry about that. For the present, don't 18 19 worry about it. MS. KANE: That was our main concern,. 20 Your Honor, is that we'll be --21 JUDGE SIPPEL: Suppose we get rid of 22

1	that concern, then do we have any concern?
2	MS. KANE: I guess it would depend on
3	what their new proposal would be.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: To bifurcate.
5	MS. KANE: I'm not sure we understand
6	exactly what they mean when they've been asking
7	for bifurcation.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: They don't participate.
9	They don't do anything in this case until
10	unless and until there is a determination of
11	liability on the part of Maritime. Then they
12	come in on the penalty side, on the assessment
13	or, you know, what do you do to a licensee who,
14	you know, has got this problem. Because then it
15	becomes their problem.
16	MS. KANE: I guess I just want to
17	clarify that when you say they're not going to
18	participate at all, they are still going to be
19	subject to discovery at least from the Bureau
20	going forward?
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's a different kind
22	of participation.

MS. KANE: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE SIPPEL: Anybody can be subject to the discovery, they too. My point being is they're not going to be required to come in here They're not going to be required to every day. put witnesses on the stand. They're not going to be engaged in cross examination. They're not going to be -- a lot of the discovery that you take is going to be taken and they will not be They can seek relief if they think subject to. too much is being asked of them. But I think that they would have an interest to work out with you some kind of an operating agreement so they can get away from me and not have to sit in this courtroom in the summer.

MS. KANE: Your Honor --

JUDGE SIPPEL: I think that would be in their interest.

MS. KANE: Well, that is not something that they had proposed to us.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's why we had today.

ł	
1	MS. KANE: They were really focused on
2	the discovery issues.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay.
4	MS. KANE: That sounds like something
5	we could agree to.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well, we'll get
7	to that. Thank you very much.
8	MR. KELLER: Your Honor?
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir.
10	MR. KELLER: I just want to say
11	something about the discovery thing.
12	The thing that I would advocate is
13	that they be treated as during the bifurcation
14	phase, that they be treated as non-parties for
15	purposes of discovery and I disagree with the
16	Bureau that that hampers the Bureau's ability to
17	collect information.
18	As you point out, even as non-parties,
19	you could take that position. You can notice
20	that position and take that. And there are some
21	slightly higher subpoena burden you've already
22	indicated you'll accommodate that.

The only other restrictions are things you can't do against a non-party are document productions, interrogatories, but these are all licensees too. So, the Bureau certainly has the ability to ask them for information in their status as regulators. So, I don't see that it really hampers the Bureau's style.

MS. KANE: I would disagree that -
JUDGE SIPPEL: That's fine. You're

disagreeing with what?

MS. KANE: Well, if we would have to go through a subpoena process and/or regulatory process to obtain interrogatories or documents that may be relevant to the subject matter of the hearing, it seems like an incredible burden that the Bureau shouldn't have to be forced to take on. And if the only discovery obtained from those depositions, many of these companies are all over the country. As it is, the Bureau is already absorbing the cost of going for other depositions that we're aware of related directly to Maritime. So, to have the only option be a

costly deposition process seems like a burden we shouldn't have to take on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm not going to comment on that. But let me say this. foresee is that there's going to be a first attempt, a very serious attempt, at cooperative discovery by way of letters or requests for documents, whatever you want to call it. And if you're being given a hard time and you've been given a hard time by any of those applicants, then you come to me. And, unfortunately, they're going to have to come back in the courtroom I don't see any reason for that to again. Everybody in this courtroom has an interest one way or another in how things come out for Maritime. And anybody that would get in the way of interfering with that because of some quirk about discovery Ι know legitimate discovery objections. I don't mean to say, I'm not talking about -- I'm not talking about the things at the edges. I'm talking about the thing in the middle. That makes no sense to

me and I don't think you're doing -- you're 1 putting yourself in a good posture with the 2 Commission in light of the relief you're going to 3 be seeking down the road. I shouldn't say relief 4 5 but what you're asking of the Commission down the road. 6 Now, is there anybody here from the 7 8 applicants who has a problem with that approach? 9 Work it out. Okay. Done. Your Honor, if I may MR. LIEBERMAN: 10 on behalf of Warren Havens and his related --11 That's different. JUDGE SIPPEL: Ι 12 I'm dealing with 13 haven't gotten to that yet. 14 applicants, not --MR. LIEBERMAN: I understand but will 15 we have the same rights that you just described 16 Bureau will have with regard 17 that the 18 discovery if there is something that we need from one of the other parties because in light of what 19 you're saying, we may or may not need to seek 20 information from one of these parties and we'd 21

like to have the same rights the Bureau does